

**AVISTA CORP.
RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

JURISDICTION:	WASHINGTON	DATE PREPARED:	07/02/2015
CASE NO.:	UE-150204 & UG-150205	WITNESS:	Don Kopczynski
REQUESTER:	Public Counsel/Energy Project	RESPONDER:	Larry La Bolle
TYPE:	Data Request	DEPT:	State & Federal Regulation
REQUEST NO.:	PC/EP – 057	TELEPHONE:	(509) 495-4710
		EMAIL:	larry.labolle@avistacorp.com

REQUEST:

Does Avista agree that the cost of AMI deployment is likely to be lower for Washington customers if the Company was deploying AMI throughout in service territory in Idaho and Oregon due to the economies of scale for the meters, communication systems, and billing and customer service integration?

RESPONSE:

Deployment of advanced metering systems, such as the program now being implemented by the Company, is staged over a period of years. Any implementation of advanced metering in Idaho as part of an “expanded” Washington program, would be completed over a period of several years that would commence near the end of the deployment in Washington. (See Avista’s response to PC/EP_DR_058)

In a deployment of advanced metering in Washington and Idaho under a single project, the Company, as stated above, would nevertheless largely complete the Washington deployment before beginning the Idaho deployment. Assuming in this hypothetical case that the overall project would require six years for Washington (as is the current plan), and an additional four years for Idaho, then the overall project would span ten years. Over a project of this duration, the Company would not be purchasing all of its meters under one contract, and not even necessarily from the same vendor. The same would apply to the communications systems technology and infrastructure.